IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

| CHARLES KALEB VANLANDINGHAM, |) | |
|---|---|----------------------|
| Administrator for the Estate of CHARLES |) | |
| LAMAR VANLANDINGHAM, |) | |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | |
| |) | |
| v. |) | Case No. 22-CV-209-D |
| |) | |
| THE CITY OF OKLAHOMA CITY, |) | |
| a municipal corporation; et al., |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendants. |) | |

JOINT MOTION TO EXTEND ALL REMAINING DEADLINES AND FOR THIRD AMENDED SCHEDULING ORDER

Plaintiff, Charles Kaleb Vanlandingham, Administrator for the Estate of Charles Lamar Vanlandingham; Defendant City of Oklahoma City; Defendant American Medical Response Ambulance Service, Inc.; and Defendant Brandon Lee, by and through counsel, submit this Joint Motion to Extend all Remaining Deadlines and for Third Amended Scheduling Order, pursuant to LCvR7.1(j). In support of this Motion, the parties state as follows:

- 1. Under the current scheduling order (Doc. 101), the remaining deadlines in the case are:
 - a. Plaintiff's objections to Defendants' exhibit lists November 14,2024
 - b. Dispositive and *Daubert* motions November 21, 2024
 - c. Discovery cutoff December 16, 2024

- d. Designations of deposition testimony, motions in limine; requested voir dire; trial briefs, requested jury instructions, proposed findings and conclusion of law (if any), and Final Pretrial Report – January 2, 2025
- e. Objections to and counter-designations of deposition testimony –

 January 9, 2025
- f. Objections to counter-designations of deposition testimony; objections or responses to motions *in limine*, requested *voir dire*, trial briefs, requested jury instructions, and proposed findings and conclusions of law January 16, 2025
- g. Jury trial to be set
- 2. The case started off slowly due to amended complaints and motions to dismiss. Since the Court's ruling on the second round of motions to dismiss, the parties have requested and received three prior extensions of deadlines. [*See* Doc. 69, 70; Doc. 78, 79; and Doc. 100, 101].
- 3. Discovery in the case was further complicated by the fact that the decedent, Lamar Vanlandingham, was not married and his adult children had little information about his health history. Because this case involves Mr. Vanlandingham's death during a health emergency, his past medical history is significant and relevant to the litigation. It has taken a considerable amount of time to identify medical providers through requests to his health insurer for claims information before such

records could then be requested.

- 4. The basis for this motion for extension is that the parties need additional time to complete the necessary depositions prior to filing dispositive motions and *Daubert* motions. The parties have completed written discovery in the case, they have exchanged documents; medical records have been requested and are nearing completion; experts were identified and reports exchanged; six fact witness depositions have been concluded; the parties are working cooperatively to try to complete the remaining fact witness depositions (Plaintiff; three of the ambulance crew who participated in Mr. Vanlandingham's care; and two firefighters who participated in Mr. Vanlandingham's care). Expert depositions will then need to be conducted.
- 5. Plaintiff's deposition has not been completed. He is currently incarcerated in Kansas which has delayed the ability to conduct that deposition. Plaintiff has indicated that substitution of the Plaintiff may be requested. The ambulance crew who participated in Mr. Vanlandingham's care, for the most part, are no longer employees of AMRAS as the OKC-AMRAS contract expired in 2020. AMRAS has worked to gain the cooperation of these witnesses and the remaining witnesses are in the process of being scheduled. AMRAS has requested the City of Oklahoma City coordinate the depositions of two of its firefighters. The setting of all these remaining depositions has been complicated due to the schedules of the parties' attorneys.
 - 6. Additionally, there are nine retained experts in the case whose

depositions will need to be set and taken.

- 7. It has become clear that the coordination of four parties' Counsels' calendars in light of the number of remaining depositions that need to be taken will require a period of time. In an effort to avoid any further requests for extension, the parties request an additional one-hundred twenty days on the remaining scheduling order deadlines.
 - 8. All parties join in this request.
- 9. No trial date has been set. If the requested extension is granted, the new deadlines would be as follows:
 - a. Plaintiff's objections to Defendants' Exhibit Lists to be filed by March 12, 2025;
 - b. Dispositive and *Daubert* motions to be filed by March 21, 2025;
 - c. Discovery to be completed by April 15, 2025;
 - d. Designations of deposition testimony; motions *in limine*; requested *voir dire*; trial briefs; requested jury instructions; proposed findings and conclusions of law (if any); and Final Pretrial Report to be filed by May 3, 2025;
 - e. Objections to and counter-designations of deposition testimony to be filed by May 10, 2025;
 - f. Objections to counter-designations of deposition testimony; objections or responses to motions *in limine*, requested *voir dire*,

trial briefs, requested jury instructions, and proposed findings and conclusions of law to be filed by May 16, 2025; and

- g. Jury trial to be set.
- 10. The precise relief requested in this motion, as set out above, is an extension of all remaining deadlines for a period of one-hundred twenty (120) days. A proposed order is being submitted with this motion.
- 11. The motion is being submitted in good faith and not for purposes of unnecessary delay.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons state above, the parties respectfully request that the Court extend all deadlines currently scheduled in the case by one-hundred twenty (120) days and issue a Third Amended Scheduling Order extending the current deadlines (Doc. 101).

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Denelda L. Richardson
Nathan E. Clark, OBA 17275
nclark@rhodesokla.com
Denelda L. Richardson, OBA 20103
drichardson@rhodesokla.com
Rhodes Hieronymus Jones Tucker & Gable
P. O. Box 21100
Tulsa, OK 74121-1100
(918) 582-1173; (918) 592-3390 (fax)
Attorneys for Defendant, American
Medical Response Ambulance Service, Inc.

/s/ W. Brett Behenna (with permission)
W. BRETT BEHENNA, OBA #30485
BEHENNA GOERKE KRAHL & MEYER
210 Park Ave. Suite 3030
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73102
Main Telephone: 405-232-3800
bb@lawfirmokc.com
Attorney for Plaintiff

/s/ Katie Goff (with permission)
Katie Goff
Richard N. Mann
Assistant Municipal Counselors
200 N. Walker, 4th Floor
Oklahoma City, OK 73102
Katie.goff@okc.gov
Richard.mann@okc.gov
Attorneys for Defendant,
City of Oklahoma City

/s/ Stacey Felkner (with permission)
Chris J. Collins
Stacey Haws Felkner
W.R. Moon
Collins, Zorn, Jones & Wagner
429 N.E. 50th St., 2nd Floor
Oklahoma City, OK 73105-1815
cjc@czwlaw.com
shf@czwlaw.com
wrm@czwlaw.com
Attorneys for Defendant,
Officer Brandon Lee

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that on the 12th day of November, 2024, I electronically transmitted this filing to the Clerk of Court using the ECF System for filing and transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to the following ECF registrants:

Katie Goff
Richard N. Mann
Assistant Municipal Counselors
200 N. Walker, 4th Floor
Oklahoma City, OK 73102
Katie.goff@okc.gov
Richard.mann@okc.gov
Attorneys for Defendant,
City of Oklahoma City

W. Brett Behenna Behenna Goerke Krahl & Meyer 210 Park Ave. Suite 3030 Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73102 bb@lawfirmokc.com Attorney for Plaintiff Chris J. Collins
Stacey Haws Felkner
W.R. Moon
Collins, Zorn, Jones & Wagner
429 N.E. 50th St., 2nd Floor
Oklahoma City, OK 73105-1815
cjc@czwlaw.com
shf@czwlaw.com
wrm@czwlaw.com
Attorneys for Defendant,
Officer Brandon Lee

/s/ Denelda L. Richardson